REMARKS

Claim 22 is revised in response to the objection in the last Office action, and to remove the "steps of" wording that might characterize the elements of that claim. Claims 1 and 26 are revised to emphasize novel subject matter over the applied art. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-20, 22, 25, 26, and 30 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

All claims remaining in this application were rejected as anticipated by newly-cited *Zellner* (US 6,539,384). The Applicant respectfully traverses that rejection.

The rejection asserts that *Zellner* discloses a diagnostic device for troubleshooting a WAP network and includes a diagnostic module for analyzing information associated with elements of the WAP network in a predetermined sequence configured to emulate a process flow of signals through elements of the WAP network. However, a close reading of *Zellner* fails to support the disclosures that the rejection attributes to the reference.

Zellner (assigned to the same assignee as the present application) discloses a portable telecommunication test set. That test set may incorporate an HTML or WAP browser allowing a technician to access the Internet to retrieve data and other technical information, while troubleshooting a communication network or telephone line (column 2, lines 59-67). The WAP browser in *Zellner* may be a commercially-available microbrowser able to read information having WAP content, i.e., information in the WML (Wireless Mark-up Language) format (Column 5, lines 55-59). See, also, column 8, lines 24-27; column 12, lines 10-12 and 23-25; column 13, lines 49-50; and columns 13 and 14 in general. Those passages show that *Zellner* discloses a WAP browser only as an alternative (to an HTML browser) for communicating between the test set and the Internet or another remotely-situated source of data. Indeed, column 13, lines 58-60 of

Zellner disclose that the remote test set may be configured to communicate with a WAP browser module "with *or without* the help of the WAP proxy/server" (emphasis supplied); and column 14, lines 43-50 state that the test sets may have HTML browsers instead of WAP browsers. *Zellner* thus discloses that a WAP browser is merely an optional way for communicating with remote data sources.

Claim 1 defines a diagnostic device for <u>troubleshooting</u> a WAP network. That diagnostic device includes a diagnostic module configured for analyzing information associated with elements of the WAP network, <u>in a predetermined sequence configured to emulate</u> a sequence of a process flow of signals through the elements of the WAP network <u>undergoing diagnosis</u> by the claimed diagnostic device. (Paragraphs 0030 and 0031 discuss those aspects of the present invention.) Method Claim 26 recites similar elements of the invention, namely, "analyzing the received information in a predetermined sequence to emulate a sequence of a process flow of signals through the element of the WAP network, for diagnosis of the WAP network element". Computer-readable medium Claim 22 also contains similar limitations. Those claims thus define novel combinations that go beyond merely equipping a test set with an (optional) WAP browser, as disclosed by *Zellner*. For those reasons, the claims of the present application are novel over that reference.

      The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and solicits a notice to that effect.

                                       Respectfully submitted,

                                       MERCHANT & GOULD

                                       /Roger T. Frost/

Date: February 16, 2007   Roger T. Frost
                                       Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

                                   39262
                                PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE